DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 846 PS 001 908

[Regional Research and Resource Center in Early Childhood.] Final Report.
New York Univ., N.Y. Inst. for Developmental Studies.
Spons Agency-Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
Report No-OEO-2425
Pub Date 68
Note-91p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.65
Descriptors-Creative Dramatics, *Culturally Disadvantaged, *Demonstration Programs, Elementary School Students, Evaluation, Inservice Teacher Education, Intelligence Quotient, Kindergarten Children, Longitudinal Studies, Mathematics, Parent Participation, Parent Reaction, Preschool Children, *Primary Grades, *Program Evaluation, Reading
Identifiers-Classroom Behavior Rating Scale, CMMS, Head Start, PPVT, School Behavior Rating Scale, Stanford Binet, WICS

Qualitative and quantitative evaluations were made of the 1967-68 academic period, the sixth year of demonstration classes, conducted by the Institute for Developmental Studies at New York University. Qualitative evaluations were obtained for reading, mathematics, classroom behavior, science, creative dramatics, and use of the Language Master through a curriculum index questionnaire, examination of teachers' daily logs, and interviews with administrators, supervisors, teachers, parents, and observers. Subjects were culturally deprived children attending prekindergarten through grade three. Conclusions were as follows: (1) ongoing inservice training is necessary, (2) purposes and limitations of the program must be continuously articulated, (3) educators should be reoriented to innovative teaching methods, and (4) parental feedback on children's relative growth should be used. Quantitative followup psychological evaluations of experimental, filler, and control subjects were made. A parent program was initiated to help with personal and environmental problems. (DO)

ED028846

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

FINAL REPORT

CONTRACT NO. OEO-2425

PS001908

F-OEO
OEO-2425

ED028846

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

FINAL REPORT

CONTRACT NO. OEO-2425

This report is being submitted in fulfillment of the Office of Economic Opportunity Contract No. OEO-2425, entitled, "Regional Research and Resource Center in Early Childhood," which covers the period September 1, 1967 - August 31, 1968.

This report is in compliance with the content and format of a prior report submitted April 15, 1968 and approved by the Research and Evaluation Division of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

PS001908

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction i

I. Qualitative Evaluations 1

A. Evaluation of Implementation 1

1. Performance of Children 1

a. Reading and Mathematics 1

b. Classroom Behavior 1

2. Content Areas 2

a. Science 2

b. Creative Dramatics 3

3. Materials - Language Master 5

B. Teachers' Logs and Interpretations 9

1. Prekindergarten 10

2. Kindergarten 18

3. First Grade 23

4. Second Grade 26

C. Overall Impressions 31

1. School Administrators 31

2. Institute Staff 33

3. Teachers 36

4. Parents 43

5. Observers 46

Conclusions 47

II. Quantitative Evaluations 50
  A. Experimentals vs. Control Samples 50
    1. Standardized General Aptitude Testing 51
    2. Specific Ability Tests 51
    3. Data Analysis 53
  B. Experimental vs. Experimental (Specific Ability Comparisons) 55
  C. Experimental vs. Experimental (Length of Exposure) 55
  D. Experimental Group (Pre-Post Tests) 56
  E. Experimental vs. Experimental (Progress Analysis) 57
    Tables 1 - 12 58-66
III. Parent Program 67
IV. Extra-Mural Training 73
V. Addenda 79
  Schedule I
  Schedule II
  Schedule III
  Schedule IV
  [redacted]

Introduction

September, 1967 marked the beginning of the sixth year of demonstration classes conducted by the Institute for Developmental Studies. The following will report both qualitative and quantitative evaluations performed during the 1967-68 academic period.

As previously established, the Institute's primary goals for its demonstration program have been to develop curricula, devise approaches to implementation and construct measurement devices, which would combine to enhance the success of disadvantaged youngsters in the school setting. During this past year, we continued to be concerned with helping children achieve three behavioral objectives: 1) to master the basic skills for academic achievement, 2) to establish a feeling of competence in learning, and 3) to develop the child's ability to function independently as a learner. The Institute's complement of curriculum staff, consisting of supervisory personnel and content specialists, work to affect both physical setting and teachers' behavior in implementing these objectives.[*]

For an appropriate perusal of this report, it is extremely important for the reader to be aware of the explosive, chaotic condition of the Harlem community in which the Institute's program functions. Words cannot describe the range of emotions which pervade the atmosphere. Rage, fear, anxiety, hatred and despair breed tensions that flare up unpredictably and instantaneously.

At P.S. 68, host school for six Institute classes this year, a black teacher was dismissed because he took his sixth grade class to a memorial service honoring the late Malcolm X. Community repercussions were immediate and intensely bitter. Aroused parents and teachers picketed the school daily. A black pupil at P.S. 68 was stationed at the door to admit only black people and deny entrance to whites.

---

[*] A statement of the goals and detailed accounts of implementation methods were described in the most recent progress report sent to the Office of Economic Opportunity. (March 30, 1968.)

Internally, the school was in a state of chaos. Children ran unrestrained through the fourth floor hallways where the dismissed teacher had formerly conducted his class. Both teacher and parent groups splintered into factions with one common denominator--disgust with existing administrative blundering.

When the newly appointed Unit Administrator began to speak with teachers and parents in the community, tensions eased. The Institute, therefore, despite some disruption was able to maintain its classes in P.S. 68.

At P.S. 175, a violent explosion occurred when a black teacher was dismissed because of "excessive" absence. During these absences, he was allegedly participating in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville demonstrations. Teachers, parents, and community groups were participants in open rebellion against the establishment. Police cars surrounded the school. The principal was escorted to his office to protect him from possible physical attack. Arrests were made. An all-night vigil in the school of both teachers and parents resulted from an unsatisfactory meeting with representatives of the Board of Education. Because of the turmoil, many parents were obliged to keep their children away from school. Naturally, Institute classes suffered from these disruptions along with regular classes. It was not possible to complete testing, and information on control populations was inaccessible to Institute staff. The situation at P.S. 175 remained unresolved, even after the official closing of school.

It is virtually impossible to estimate to what extent this climate has affected the academic and psychological behavior of the children or the professional performance of the Institute's curriculum and evaluation staff.

These experiences have emphasized the fact that the program which attempts to function within an existing school setting cannot be separated from the inherent social forces of the community. The innovative program may actually, albeit unintentionally, cause agitation among parents whose children are part of the traditional classroom. When achievement differences among students begin to be evident, parents are justifiably indignant that the superior program is not made available to all the youngsters. Thus, those who would embark on the special programs which are designed to enhance school performance and whose effects are measured in terms of differences between experimental and control samples need to anticipate being constantly faced with complex dilemmas.

Even in those schools where such overt turmoil did not exist during this past year there is evidence of the same kinds of forces and issues in play: It is the representation of the current American crisis. This is the context in which the Institute's work was done and in which this report was written.

I. QUALITATIVE EVALUATIONS

A. Evaluation of Implementation

A daily curriculum log was maintained by the Early Childhood Coordinator. These records consisted essentially of the minutes of meetings held among curriculum and research staff. During the fall and winter months, heavy emphasis was placed on implementation of curriculum goals. In the spring, more attention was paid to evaluation of the demonstration program. Evaluations of content areas were performed along several dimensions. For reading, mathematics, and general classroom behavior, the performance of individual children was examined. For both science and creative dramatics, approaches to implementation of content were the focus. In addition, further information was gathered about the use of a particular piece of equipment, the Language Master.

1. Performance of Children

a. Reading and Mathematics

A form for reading and a form for mathematics were constructed for completion by teachers. They served to: 1) review sequentially the content areas, and 2) provide status information about each child. (See addenda schedules 1 and 2 for copies of these forms.)

b. Classroom Behavior

It was decided that information relevant to each child's classroom behavior would be helpful to the next teacher. Several items were selected from the Davidson Classroom Behavior Rating Scale * and placed in checklist form for teachers to complete. (See addenda schedule 3.)

---

* Davidson, Helen H., Greenberg, Judith W., Traits of School Achievers from a Deprived Background, College of the City University of New York, 1967, p. 46.

The school administrators were advised of the use of these forms. All of them were pleased to have them placed in the cumulative record folder of third grade Institute children. The forms completed for first and second grade experimental children will be distributed to their respective teachers when school begins in the fall.

2. Content Areas

a. Science (A.A.A.S. Program)

A final meeting of teachers and supervisors was conducted by the science specialist to determine to what extent the A.A.A.S. program was implemented by the grade teachers. The meeting revealed a number of teacher attitudes about the program.

Both teachers and assistant teachers liked the manuals and materials of A.A.A.S. However, they felt that in order to properly execute each unit, they needed to keep referring to the manual. They believed that with practice a teacher could become more proficient in doing a lesson. One person suggested that the assistant teachers within each school divide the units so that each one would be responsible for developing expertise in a particular subject area. Each assistant would then present those units related to his area of expertise to all the Institute classes within his school. Supervisors agreed that this might be a more efficient way of implementing the material than the previous approach of requiring each classroom teacher to present all the lessons.

Another point discussed at the meeting was the use of the materials out of sequence. Some teachers thought lessons should be conducted on particular subject areas when these were pertinent to other ongoing class work or discussion. However, the nature of the A.A.A.S. materials is such that the science specialist pointed out that wanting to use the material out of sequence was indicative of the teachers' lack of understanding of the sequence structure for the overall program: They saw each unit in terms of their own notion of a sequence and in terms of its specific content, rather than as part of a sequentially organized curriculum geared towards developing the process of inquiry. In addition, the teachers did not seem able to explain the rationale for their selection of sequence, other than that they wanted to use the content spontaneously as a need or opportunity arose.

It appears that in order to have properly implemented this kind of program, more in-depth training would have been required. While the teachers' skill was adequate for demonstration of the units, their knowledge had not been sufficiently developed for them to understand the relationship of each unit to the total program.

The evaluation of the science programs led curriculum staff into some generalizations about previous inservice training modes. In the past, careful attention had been paid to the purpose and use of each new piece of equipment. However, since many of the materials were innovative, teachers needed to spend time learning the manipulation of the game or machine. It is possible that the techniques themselves overshadowed the learning purposes for which they were designed. Thus, the teachers may have become more oriented to the materials than to their purpose. This concern led to the decision that a review of Institute materials in terms of overall objectives needs to be performed by teaching and supervisory staff.

b. Creative Dramatics

The creative dramatics specialist analyzed implementation strategies employed to develop in teachers the necessary repertoire to use this aspect of Institute curriculum. The first step was demonstration of creative dramatics lessons in prekindergarten classes twice a week. As a result of these demonstrations, curriculum staff decided that creative dramatics would contribute to the realization of goals characteristic of the Institute's program, particularly those related to the development of both cognitive skills and self-concept.

Teachers were asked to schedule three 20 to 30 minute periods of creative dramatics each week. This turned out to be a most important step because it represented the Institute's commitment to this curriculum. The next step was to provide teachers with adequate skills and self-confidence to fulfill this commitment. Training began with the specialist and the teachers planning the first week's work together.

The specialist provided teachers with specially developed units and demonstrated specific techniques during teachers' meetings. From previous work, the specialist had concluded that beginning with demonstration in the classroom retarded rather than facilitated the teacher's willingness to initiate creative dramatics lessons.

When teachers began work with children, the specialist participated in the activity along with the students. As the teachers became more proficient, the specialist merely observed once each week. Follow-up meetings with teachers dealt with these observations.

Finally, after the teachers had gained sufficient competence to lead the children effectively, the specialist sought to introduce new units in the classroom. At this point, demonstrations were performed by the specialist with children while teachers observed. Follow-up meetings were held to elicit plans for the teachers' use of the techniques demonstrated. When teachers then adopted the new units, the specialist again became a participant along with the children. The specialist continued to supply detailed, specially prepared guidelines to teachers.

Teachers have reported that creative dramatics has been a vehicle for developing assurance and confidence in many children who were otherwise withdrawn and reticent in large group activities. They feel that this confidence has extended to participation in other classroom activities and has enhanced these children's relationships with their peers. In addition, they report that for many children the creative dramatics experience awakened an interest in reading many more stories.

Although all the teachers agree that creative dramatics has contributed to the cognitive and affective development of children, they do not consistently apply its techniques. However, toward the end of the last school year, six teachers had begun to utilize creative dramatics techniques to vitalize other areas of curriculum. Hopefully, next year's classes will enjoy further development of creative dramatics activities in the teaching of numerous aspects of the Institute's program.

3. Materials - Language Master

The following are some brief comments which summarize most of the points raised in the Curriculum Index questionnaire.* The purpose of this summary is to help the curriculum staff focus on specific issues related to: 1) current uses of Language Master (L-M) equipment and materials in Institute classrooms, kindergarten through the third grade, and 2) identification of more desirable and less desirable uses.

We would hope to move from discussion of the issues to a formulation of a written statement reflecting our consensus about more and less desirable uses of the L-M equipment and materials.

PS 001908

---

* A copy of this questionnaire and the responses were submitted as part of the most recent Progress Report to the Office of Economic Opportunity, March 30, 1968.

Also, in September we intend to address ourselves in similar fashion to other Curriculum Index data.

Responses to the questionnaire indicate that the usual practice is to have one L-M machine and one set of earphones in each Kindergarten, first, second, and third grade classroom. The equipment usually is located on a child-height table, along a wall near the Listening Center.

The teachers use the L-M materials as a follow-up activity for information and skills previously introduced. In this way the L-M materials can reinforce recent learning. Also, teachers often have a child use the materials to help overcome a specific problem, e.g., difficulty in blending certain sounds.

Although the children are allowed to choose to use the machine at certain times during the day, the materials are controlled by the teachers. At other times the teachers assign particular children to work with the machine and certain materials.

The teachers oversee each child while he begins to learn to operate the equipment and to handle the materials. After he has mastered those tasks, he works at them independently; a teacher will check briefly the conclusion of his work.

Our usual procedure in introducing the machine to the children is: A teacher explains and demonstrates operation of the equipment and materials to a small group of children. Then each child, one at a time, listens through the headset while the teacher operates the equipment. Finally, the teacher works with each child to help him master the tasks of operation.

Some kindergarten children are not yet able to use or to profit from using the machine. Such children typically progress to it during the first grade year. Although the machine is in daily use, each child who uses it does so on the average of 2 to 3 times a week with sometimes a greater frequency at the third-grade level, depending on availability of new materials.

There is some variation in the teachers' mode of machine use and in the extent and type of records they keep for its use by each child. For records, some maintain a daily log, noting for each child the date, set of materials used, his degree of success, and a brief note for future reference. Some maintain a checklist, checked by the teacher or by each child who uses the machine. Some note, once a week, which cards were used during the week.

At least one teacher in each of our classrooms prepares sets of cards for the children to use in the machine. The bulk of this preparation is usually a team effort; sometimes a few children are a part of the team. We use only those cards prepared by Institute Staff.

Not all the teachers require the children to record their own responses on the tape. If a child does record his response, he does so immediately after he hears the pre-recorded model. The follow up by a teacher to his recordings varies among our teachers. Some listen with the child to each recording and discuss the recording with him; some do little or nothing; some spot check a few or listen to most of the recordings at some time during or after school hours.

In response to the question, "Do you employ the machine principally to develop language in children?" one half of our teachers said no. Except for one, those who said no also added that they use it to help children with phonetic skills and problems.

About half the teachers employ the machine to help children reinforce their learning of certain concepts, reading vocabulary, and sentence structure. Some employ it to introduce certain new concepts or words.

All the teachers indicate that the movement of the L-M card in the machine does not distract the children; on the contrary, teachers believe that this movement actually helps to engage a child's attention.

Except when they wish there were more recording time per card, our teachers have no mechanical problems in recording their own voices. Of course, there is a problem when teachers record in the classroom when the children are present (and this is necessarily often); the microphone picks up all sound in the room. Also, some children err and erase the teacher's voice.

Discussion

Teachers in the Institute's program employ the L-M equipment and materials in varieties of ways and for differing purposes. This is a healthy situation and certainly one that helps the curriculum staff to identify the more productive alternatives.

At least three points seem to stand out in analysis of the questionnaire, and these may require more intensive analysis than the others. The first is the matter of record keeping. Perhaps we should identify and insist on the use of a more uniform, systematic, and specific procedure and form.

The second is that of follow-up. At present it seems that some children operate entirely on their own with no feedback from a teacher. Perhaps we can identify situations in which this is permissible, and at the same time devise alternative ways to provide follow-up.

The third point is that we evidently do not all share a common understanding of what comprises "language" and "language development." Some of the teachers tend to separate language from reading skills. Perhaps this is as it should be, perhaps not. At least we can discuss the issues.

Overall, we must conclude that the application of the questionnaire yielded very valuable information about the actual classroom use of this equipment, and that this information can serve as a basis for further developments of the L-M technique.

B. Teachers' Logs

Samples of teachers' daily logs were selected for inclusion in this report in order to show typical schedules in prekindergarten, kindergarten, first and second grade classrooms.* The record form was organized to indicate the following information: 1) time spent at an activity, 2) whether the activity was directed by the teacher, or the assistant teacher, and 3) materials used.

A discussion will follow each of the logs to interpret the teaching purposes of particular activities and to highlight those aspects which are characteristic of the Institute's approaches to implementation.

---

* The typical Institute third grade class is organized very similarly to second grade classes. Of course, the work assigned is suited to the more advanced ability of the children. In one class a newspaper was produced periodically by the entire group. Work on the newspaper was directed primarily by the children themselves.

A = Activity
O = Objective

GRADE: PREKINDERGARTEN
DATE: JANUARY 24, 1968

TIME	TEACHER	MATERIALS	TIME	ASST. TEACHER	MATERIALS
8:40 9:40	A & O--See attached activity sheet. Work with individual children on cognitive, perceptual and conceptual learning, especially mathematics and language prereading skills.	Teacher-made equipment, Alphabet Board, name cards, number materials, sorting materials.	8:40 9:40	Work with small groups and individuals to develop language skills, perceptual and cognitive skills.	Formal games: Language Lotto, Matrix Board and the other quiet, work-time materials.
9:40 9:55	A--Music "Punchinello" circle game. O--Movement in original ways, large muscle coordination.	None.	9:40 9:55	Participates in group, giving aid to children near her.	
Whenever Mr. Fisher comes for ½ hour.	A--Music and dancing with Andre Fisher. O--Self-expression, developing pride in Negro culture, relating to adult Negro male.	Record player, musical instruments.	Whenever Mr. Fisher comes for ½ hour.	Reacts and participates as member of the group.	
9:55 10:10	A--Lesson on sets. O--Increase understanding the concept of set. (A) Review previous definition, review specific categories of sets. Have	None.	9:55 10:10	Participates.	

TIME	TEACHER	MATERIALS	TIME	ASST. TEACHER	MATERIALS
	children group themselves in various specific sets, e.g., boys, girls, children wearing boots, those wearing blue, etc.				
10:10 10:40	A--Children have use of different media to express and develop symbolic representation of world, building, molding, painting. Teacher moves among different groups of children. O--Develop symbolic expression, imitation, make-believe.	Blocks, dollhouse, fingerpaint, clay.	10:10 10:40	Same.	Same.
10:45 11:00	A--Reads stories and discusses books with individuals and small groups. O--Familiarity with books, ability to tell stories, and enjoy them.	Books.	10:45 11:00	Same.	Books.
11:05 11:20	A--Reads Whistle for the Train. O--Increase knowledge of trains in preparation for next week's trip to Grand Central.	Book.	11:05 11:20	Listens, encourages individuals to pay attention if necessary.	None.

PREKINDERGARTEN

TIME	TEACHER	MATERIALS	TIME	ASST. TEACHER	MATERIALS
11:25 11:40	A--Outdoor play. O--Large muscle movements, cooperative and social play.	Outdoor equipment, including bicycle and doll carriage.	11:25 11:40	Set up lunch with two children. Aid children in accepting responsibility and doing a necessary job for the good of the group.	Plates, "silverware," milk, food, etc.
11:40 12:00	A--Lunch O--Nourishment, and social conversation.	Food and materials.	11:40 12:00	Same (each teacher eats with one table of children.)	Same.

PREKINDERGARTEN

	Numbers	Language and Pre-reading	Other Discrimination
B.A.	Count to 5	Name, alphabet board.	Big-middle-little, same-different, dominoes.
B.R.	Count and match 5.	Name.	Talk about pictures.
D.S.	Count - match 5.	Name.	Pictures-needs more work.
G.L.	Numerals 6-10, sets.	Rhyming-very good.	Writing numerals, 10 shapes.
M.D.	Middle size, sets.	Name.	Shapes.
P.S.	Numerals 1-5, match numerals, sets.	Name, rhyming-very good.	Triangle versus square.
W.D.	Sets.	Name.	Big-middle-little, very good, shape games.
B.A.	Big-middle-little, counting.	Name.	
D.C.	Numerals 1-5, sticks, count to 5.	Talked about his firemen book, lost interest by end. Picture dominoes-good.	
H.A.	Numerals 1-5, sets.	Name, alphabet board.	Shapes, dog puzzle.
J.A.	Numerals 1-5, count to 5, number sort.	Name.	Shapes, work on square.
J.E.	Numerals 1-5, sets.	Alphabet board, rhyming.	Shapes.
M.L.	Count to 5, match with sticks-chips, big-little.	Name.	Colors pictures, can't say too much, fragmented perception.
N.J.	Count and match 5.	Name, alphabet board.	Talked about fireman pictures, told fairly coherent story, sort shapes.
S.R.	Numerals 6-10, middle size.	Name, rhyming-fair.	
D.M.	Match and count 1-5.	Name, alphabet board.	Lotto, colors, same-different, size.

1. Interpretation of Prekindergarten Log

The foregoing log is a sample from the daily log written by a prekindergarten teacher at one school.

8:40-9:40 This is the first block of time in the morning and is called the Quiet Work Period. The log refers to an attached activity sheet which shows the teachers' plans for specific activities for each child in the class for one week. (In the actual activity sheet, the children's full names are listed.) The objective of these activities during this time of the day was for the teachers to work with individual children on activities and with materials which are designed to develop perceptual and conceptual learnings in the areas of language, prereading, and mathematics.

For example, several children worked on learning to match, count, and order numbers from 1-15. Some used the letter form board (alphabet board) to practice letter discrimination and identification of letters by name. Others were learning to differentiate big and little, same and different with several kinds and sizes of domino blocks. Several children, who had mastered the numbers from 1-5, were working with numbers from 6-10. Other children were working with cards to match sets of objects. Many children were ordering the letters of their names with felt-backed cardboard letters following a model which was printed on a card. Other children were matching cards with pictures of objects that rhymed--e.g., pictures of cat and hat; brush and mush.

During the quiet work period, while the teacher was working with individual children, the assistant teacher worked with small groups (3-4 children) with the Language Lotto game and the Matrix Board. Language Lotto is a small-group game designed to develop perceptual and language abilities.

9:40-
9:55 The next activity listed on the sample log is music. A circle game, "Punchinello" was played with the entire group. Both the teacher and the assistant teacher were part of the group. The objective of this game was to develop large muscle coordination and to help children think of and act out a wide variety of body movements.

During the music period on this particular day, a young Negro college student, who visited the class once a week and brought with him African drums and recordings and led the group in singing and rhythmic movement.

9:55-
10:10 The teacher worked with a group, giving a short lesson whose objective was to increase the children's understanding of the concept of sets. She reviewed the definition of a set and had the children group themselves into various kinds of sets, e.g., a set of boys; a set of girls; a set of children; a set of children with blue in their clothing; a set of children wearing boots. These activities sought to review and reinforce knowledge of the meaning of sets through concrete motor activities. During this lesson the assistant teacher participated with the children, offering help when needed and serving as a model for the children.

10:10-
10:40 The children engaged in free-choice activities with various materials in the room, e.g., block, doll corner, art materials, puzzles, woodworking, manipulative materials. During this activity period the children had opportunities to use different media to develop and express symbolic representations of their world through building, molding, painting, and dramatic play. The objective of these experiences was to learn to imitate and to make-believe. Both the teacher and the assistant teacher moved among the children and interacted with them to encourage

language expression and communication as well as to clarify concepts, add information and correct misconceptions.

10:45-11:00 The children had a library period in the classroom. All the children moved into the book corner to "read" books by themselves or to listen to the teacher read to small groups of children. Here children become familiar with books and stories, learn to tell stories to the teacher and to each other, and learn to enjoy them.

11:05-11:20 One teacher read a story to the entire group. The children learn to develop attention through the medium of a story-telling activity. On the day recorded in the log, the teacher read Whistle For the Train. Her specific objective in choosing that book was to increase the children's store of information about trains in preparation for a trip to Grand Central Station.

11:25-11:40 The children engaged in outdoor play with equipment such as rocking boat, hollow blocks, wagons, trucks, bicycles, doll carriages, walking board, etc. The objectives of this activity were to develop large muscles and motor coordination, to encourage social and cooperative play, to encourage language expression, and review information pertaining to previous perceptual and conceptual learnings as they emerged in the play.

During the outdoor play period the assistant teacher, with the help of two children, set up the tables in the classroom for lunch. The children were engaged in putting into action their understanding of one-to-one correspondence as they set each place for lunch with table mats, silverware, plates, and milk containers. In addition, the children were developing a sense of responsibility for sharing a necessary job and contributing to the welfare of the entire group.

11:40-12:00 The children and the teachers had lunch together. Each teacher sat with half the group at one table, served the food, encouraged verbal expression and conversation.

After lunch each child cleaned his own place and prepared to go home.

GRADE: KINDERGARTEN
DATE: JANUARY 18, 1968

TIME	TEACHER	MATERIALS		ASST. TEACHER	MATERIALS
8:40	QUIET WORK Numbers: supply amount for numeral "X" more. Phonics: supply letter for pictures.	Games and material from white cupboard. Free choice when work sheets have been completed.	8:40	Administer math inventory I and complete math inventory II with those children who have been absent.	Listening Center. Math test tapes.
9:15	Group to gym for physical activity and games. Discuss rules for behavior in gym, such as no screaming.		9:15	Bring children (stragglers) to gym when they have completed tasks in room.	
9:35	Music, rhythms, and songs.	Records and guitar.	9:35	Assist with music.	
10:00	Activity period.	Blocks, clay, crayons, paint, sand, doll area-grocery store.	10:00	Play games with children who need help in particular areas.	Ordering game, red and black bingo, phonics lotto.
10:40	Continue with activities. Prepare tables for lunch. Committee sets correct number of places.	Cups, napkins, mats, plates, silverware. 	10:40	Take group for rest period as children finish cleaning up.	Songs, records for rest.
			10:55	Children put away mats, prepare for story time.	

KINDERGARTEN

TIME	TEACHER	MATERIALS	TIME	ASST. TEACHER	MATERIALS
11:00	Discussion on where things come from before they reach the store as introduction of unit on food and clothing.	Grocery store in doll area.			
	Story time.	Ask Mr. Bear.			
11:20	Children prepare food for tables.	Milk, bread, meat etc.			
			11:25	Discussion about story. Preparation for lunch. Replace mats, wash hands, go to tables.	
11:30	Lunch.		11:30	Lunch.	
12:00	Dismissal.		12:00	Dismissal.	

2. Interpretation of Kindergarten Log

The foregoing log is a sample of daily logs written by a kindergarten teacher and her assistant. It will be noted that the scheduling of activities and attention to grouping follows a pattern similar to that of the prekindergarten class. Of course, the work becomes more sophisticated and the discussions can be more directed to specific topics of interest, as the children develop their cognitive and verbal abilities.

8:40- During the quiet work period, one group of children was assigned to two types of activities. One involved work with numbers and one involved work with beginning sounds. The number work sheet required the children to draw the correct number of objects to match the numerals given. The phonics work consisted of words illustrated by pictures on worksheets. The initial letter of each word was written by the student alongside the picture. These exercises had been prepared by the teachers according to the needs of the children and were placed on the cupboard where the children could find them independently.

At the same time the assistant teacher administered a mathematics inventory to those children who had been absent when it had been given previously. This inventory was designed to assess the knowledge each child had about specific number concepts and relationships which had previously been taught.

When assigned work had been checked by the teacher, the children were free to make choices of other materials as long as their choices were within the limits of activities permissible during the quiet work period.

9:15- The assistant teacher took one group of children to the gym for physical activity and games. The teacher joined them later with the rest of the class after they had completed their assigned tasks in the classroom.

9:35-10:00 The class participated in a music period which included singing, rhythmic movement, and playing musical instruments.

10:00-10:40 The class engaged in freely chosen activities and materials such as block building, sand play, play in the doll area, art activities, and woodworking. The assistant teacher worked with small groups of children (3 or 4) who needed practice in particular areas of learning. For example, he would play games of number bingo, phonics lotto, or Language Lotto with them.

After clean-up the assistant teacher supervised a formal rest period while songs and quiet music were playing on the phonograph. During rest-time the committee responsible for setting the tables for lunch went to work. The names of the children on the lunch committee were posted on the board so that the children could refer to it if they were not sure of their assignments. The children also referred to a wall chart to help them set each place with mats, napkins, silverware, plates, and milk.

10:55- All the children put their rest mats away and prepared for story-time.

In addition to a story, which was Ask Mr. Bear on this particular day, the teacher planned a discussion period about the grocery store which had been set up in the doll area. Her objective was to develop awareness of where different foods come from before they reach the store. This was the beginning of a unit of work on food and clothing.

11:20- The children replaced their seat mats, washed their hands and went to their places at the lunch table. The children helped the teachers serve the food. At each table one or two children were responsible for serving such things as milk, bread, and dessert. During lunch the teachers encouraged conversation and socialization. As soon as each child had finished eating, he cleaned his place, got his clothing, dressed, and waited to be picked up by parents or siblings.

FIRST GRADE
DATE: JANUARY 31, 1968

TIME	TEACHER	MATERIALS	TIME	ASST. TEACHER	MATERIALS
8:40 9:00	Opening exercises.		8:40 9:00		Language Master.
9:00 9:15	Middle group reading.	Word books and dictation from story.	9:00 9:15	Bottom reading group.	Sullivan workbooks A.
9:15 9:45	Top reading group. Check oral reading.	Sullivan workbooks, 1 and 2 plus SRA.	9:15 9:45	Middle reading group.	Sullivan workbooks A.
9:45 10:15	Physical education.		9:45 10:15	Tutorial help.	
10:15 10:45	Language Matrix Board.	Unit 3.	10:15 10:45	Supervise Listening Center.	Listen, Mark, and Say.
10:45 11:15	Mathematics--slow group additions writing 1-6.		10:45 11:15	Faster math group.	Independent workbooks and math lab sheets.
1:00 1:15	Slow group reading.	Matrix Board.	1:00 1:15	Middle group reading.	Sullivan A.
1:15 1:30	Fast reading group.	Sullivan.			
1:30 2:00	Dramatic Arts--act out story, "Little Red Hen."		1:30 2:00	Supervise Listening Center.	
2:00 2:30	Science--Exercise C, activity 3.		2:00 2:30	Clerical help and tutorial.	

3. Interpretation of 1st Grade Log

The foregoing log provides a sample of the daily logs written by a first-grade teacher and her assistant. A snack time is not recorded, since children may choose to eat their snacks at any time during the morning. Snacks are set out in the back of the room before the day starts.

This log shows how a first grade class begins to depart from kindergarten routines. The teacher begins the day with a whole class experience. Quiet work time is then replaced by reading time. Nevertheless, the previous pattern of small group-teaching and individualized tutoring remains. Children begin to work more independently through the use of appropriate materials, such as the Listening Center, Language Master, Sullivan workbooks and Rasmussen mathematics worksheets.

8:00-9:00 This particular teacher conducted a daily routine with the whole class at the beginning of each school day of taking attendance and observing and recording the weather and the temperature. In addition, the day's activities were listed on the blackboard, and the children read their assignments with the teacher's help.

9:00-9:45 The teacher used words from word books the children had made themselves in previous lessons for dictation of a story to a group of children. The children then chose new words to add to their word books. Then the group with the head teacher moved to work with the assistant teacher using their reading workbooks. The head teacher observed while some of the children worked independently in their Sullivan workbooks and others used the SRA reading laboratory kit. She then had several of these children read aloud from their books. The Language Master was used by individual children who were given materials by the assistant teacher.

9:45-10:15 The head teacher took the entire class outdoors for physical activity, while the assistant teacher gave tutorial help to one child who was having particular difficulty in one of the basic skill areas.

10:15-10:45 The teacher taught a lesson from the Matrix Board to the larger group, while the assistant supervised children in the Listening Center using Listen, Mark & Say tapes. The assistant set out mathematics materials for the following lesson.

10:45-11:15 The teacher worked with children in the slower mathematics group on number facts 1-6. The assistant supervised children working independently in mathematics workbooks and individually assigned mathematics laboratory sheets.

11:15-1:00 The children put away materials and prepared for lunch dismissal. Lunch time is from 11:30 until 1:00.

1:00-1:30 The teacher taught a group with the Matrix Board, while another group worked independently with Sullivan reading materials. The assistant read from the Sullivan Teachers manual to the children working in Book A.

1:30-2:00 The teacher worked with a group who acted out the story of the Little Red Hen. Four children worked in the Listening Center supervised by the assistant.

2:00-2:40 The teacher taught a science unit to the whole class. The assistant provided individual help to a few children and then constructed mimeographed worksheets for the following day.

2:40-3:00 Class dismissal.

SECOND GRADE
JANUARY 16, 1968

TIME	TEACHER	MATERIALS	TIME	ASST. TEACHER	MATERIALS
8:40	Greeting children, morning snack, preparing materials for reading.	Large table for preparation and serving rolled oats, measuring cups, hot plate, plastic bowls for all spoons, napkins.	8:40	Supervising snack preparation and serving.	Same.
9:10	Reading from Bank Street Readers about Dinosaurs. (Jimmy, Ronald and Stephen)	Bank Street Readers, blackboard list of new words in story, chart paper with running list of words: 1) contractions, 2) Compound words.	9:10	Checking children's work as they finish.	Language Master. Sullivan Workbooks. SRA Booklets. Listening Center (Read (Reader's Digest Stories) Flash cards prepared for one child.
	Tutorial work.	Two pages in Sullivan Workbook A.		Tutorial work.	
9:50	Preparation period.		9:50	Preparation period.	
10:40	Science: Classifying shells according to size, shape, and color. Other categories suggested by children.	AAAS Kit.	10:40	Helping to involve children by asking questions when there is a lag.	
11:15	Toileting and lunch.		11:15	Same.	

SECOND GRADE

TIME	TEACHER	MATERIALS	TIME	ASST. TEACHER	MATERIALS
12:40	Mathematics group work.	Houghton-Mifflin workbooks, Stern Books, Number track, Quisenaire rods, Stern cases, math lab sheets.	12:40	Same.	
1:00	Special tutoring. Understanding tens and units (two children).	Number track, Stern rods.			
1:30	Preparing materials for continuing work on mural of Nomusa's Village.	Paint, scissors, crayons, paper, table.	1:30	Story time.	Story from Thirty One Brothers and Sisters.
2:00	Children work on mural.		2:00	Supervising work with groups knitting, playing Lotto.	Knitting needles, yarn. Language Lotto.
2:30	Outdoor play.		2:30	Same.	
3:00	Dismissal from school yard.		3:00	Same.	

4. Interpretation of 2nd Grade Log

The foregoing provided a sample of daily logs written by a second-grade teacher and her assistant. This class began each day with a morning snack, then proceeded to work on basic skills independently and in small groups. Since this was an unusually small class of twelve students, the teacher was able to conduct science lessons with the entire group. The A.A.A.S. program was used, and each unit was intended to emphasize cognitive and language development, along with acquisition of information. In this second grade class, as well as in Institute third grade classes, more and more independent experiences are possible. Teachers continue to observe in order to make appropriate day-to-day assignments to the children and to work directly with those who need help in particular skill areas.

8:40-9:10 As the children arrived they were greeted by their teacher. A snack committee of four children was selected each week and these students were totally responsible for the morning refreshment. They maintained a budget book, chose a menu, shopped for the food, prepared the meal, and served it to their classmates. Recipes were posted daily by the teachers at the food preparation area. The task obviously required a variety of skills. After initial guidance from their teachers, the children were able to carry on this activity independently.

9:10-9:50 Both teachers worked on reading skills with small groups of children. The groups rotated among the teacher, assistant teacher, and Listening Center, and one child at a time used the Language Master. A variety of materials was used to meet individual needs. One group was assigned a story from the Bank Street Readers. New words were presented by the teacher and each child kept his own list of words. Sullivan workbooks were used independently by the students. The assistant teacher checked completed test pages. SRA booklets were read silently, and the exercise completed. The assistant teacher also checked this work when it was finished. The assistant teacher had taped several Reader's Digest stories and the children listened to these stories at the Listening Center, then answered relevant questions. One child used his own list of words at the Language Master, then completed two pages of his workbook under the teacher's supervision. The assistant teacher worked individually with another child, after he completed his listening center work.

9:50-10:40 Teachers' preparation period enabled both teachers to spend time planning lessons and meeting with Institute supervisors and content specialists. At this time, cluster teachers worked with the children on art or music activities. The work of the cluster teacher is not under Institute supervision.

10:40-11:15 The science lesson involved questioning and forming opinions about size and shape of shells. The entire class and the assistant participated.

11:15-12:50 Routines and lunch.

12:50-1:00 Based on observations during the previous days' work, the teacher assigned individuals to independent work in mathematics. A variety of commercial and Institute-made materials was used. Children assigned to the lunch committee prepared their budget at this time.

1:00-1:30 The teacher used manipulative mathematics materials to tutor two children, while the assistant gave help in the previously assigned tasks as needed.

1:30-
2:00 The assistant teacher read a book to the whole class while the head teacher set out the materials for mural painting.

2:00-
2:40 The teacher supervised the continuation of work on the mural painting which illustrated a story read and discussed previously. The assistant teacher had taught several children to knit. She continued to help these children knit simple items. At this time, another group of children played Language Lotto independently, as a reading game. The "caller" read each card, and the players searched for the picture described.

2:40-
3:00 The mural materials, knitting and Language Lotto game were replaced by the children on the shelves and closets where they were customarily stored. Children then lined up to leave the building as a class.

C. Overall Impressions.

This section deals with impressionistic judgments and opinions gathered through a variety of methods from both Institute and non-Institute sources. Subjects include school administrators, supervisors, teachers, parents, and observers.

The information to be reported has been organized as to: 1) source, 2) method of obtaining impressions, 3) summary, and 4) discussion.

1. School Administrators

a. Source: Principals and assistant principals at the four schools where the Institute's program is housed.

b. Method: By means of open-ended, unstructured discussions, four principals and five assistant principals were interviewed one at a time by the Early Childhood Coordinator.

c. Summary: All the administrators interviewed expressed very favorable opinions towards the overall program. Only one did not observe differences in progress between experimental children and those in the regular school program. Several commented on the superior reading scores and verbal ability of Institute youngsters. One principal felt that the classroom behavior of Institute children was worse than those in regular classes. Another principal said that Institute children were better behaved. Most reported no difference in behavior. The majority of principals and assistants saw the program's key strength in the materials and personnel provided the teacher. They noted the relaxed atmosphere of the classrooms, but most of the administrators said that individual teacher effectiveness was generally the main factor in successful operation of the classroom.

The majority reported that parents strongly support the program. One assistant principal said that the parents of third grade children in the Institute's program never complained to him, while those with children in the regular classes made frequent calls because problems had arisen.

Several principals felt that there was a lack of direct communication to them from Institute staff. They felt they wanted more specific dissemination of information to answer their needs. They would like to know what published materials to purchase, which techniques would be useful in their classes, etc. In addition, the Institute's program tended to be separate from the rest of the school. At times, this separateness, together with the special resources and personnel available to Institute teachers, caused resentment from regular teachers.

d. Discussion: While the direct interview method, of course, leaves something to be desired from a research standpoint, it seems superior to a questionnaire approach, which would involve an exceedingly complex procedure for both experimenter and respondent. Also, anonymity would be substantially impossible in so small a group. Further, the principals are at liberty not to have the program in their schools, and if they actually felt negatively about it, would exercise that prerogative.

It is to the credit of both school administrative and Institute staff that generally favorable relationships exist at this time. For six years the Institute has stood in a unique and demanding position. We have sought to impose ourselves on existing school facilities to study methods of improving education but because of research demands (i.e., the necessity to maintain "experimental" as distinct from "control" classes). We have been unable to repay the hospitality of the schools by sharing results.

To the interviewer, it appeared that administrative tasks tend to cause principals and assistant principals to focus more on the behavior of teachers than children. Their attitude towards the Institute's program is reflective of their genuine concern that teachers need more support, resources, and materials than the regular school facility is able to provide.

During the forthcoming academic year, the Institute hopes to provide additional information to those principals who have requested more specific guidance. Particularly in the prekindergarten and kindergarten classes where innovation has been most dramatic, the Institute sees an obligation to its host schools to disseminate its strategies and materials.

2. Institute Staff

a. Source: Supervisors

b. Method: The four supervisors who functioned at the Institute and in the schools this year and a former Institute supervisor were asked to write individual summaries of their impressions of the program. They dealt mainly with the questions: What were our failures? What were our successes? What changes or modifications need to be introduced?

c. Summary: The majority of the supervisors reported that individualization of instruction was a significant area of success. Most of the reports also stated that this year's work in defining the role of assistant teacher was a major success area. They felt that a marked improvement was shown in teachers' ability to group children for mathematics instruction. The majority agreed that the supervisors themselves enjoyed more effective working relationships with one another.

Other success areas cited were more specific to each supervisor's own particular goals. Among those mentioned were: the implementation of a breakfast program, closer contact with teachers, more effective relations with school personnel, and improved techniques for handling disruptive children. Most felt that their successes were to some degree possible because of the early teacher orientation and observations performed during the first days of school. The majority concurred that the method of evaluating individual children by means of the specially developed report form was singularly helpful in implementing individualization of instruction.

The impressions of the person who formerly supervised were based on her several years of experience and included descriptions of the program when it was first begun in the grades. The areas of success delineated were: improved performance in reading, increased pupil involvement in learning situations, marked gains in establishing an appropriate climate for learning, provisions for increased instructional time through reduction of time-consuming routines, and development of children's independent work habits.

The reasons for these successes were seen to be: assistant teachers who teach, content specialists in areas of science, reading, and creative dramatics, funds for nutritional program, and delineation of sequence of skills in curriculum areas.

As for failures, all five people made some reference to the inservice training of teachers in this category. Three felt that more meetings among the teachers in different schools should have been provided. Two felt teachers should have had greater opportunity to generally communicate with one another. One felt that time for more intra-school classroom visits should have been provided Institute teachers. Two reported that a sufficient sense of responsibility and significance in their attachment to a research study had not been developed in the teachers.

All five concurred that there has been inadequate involvement of research staff in teachers' meetings and in actual classroom operations and teacher contacts. The majority also felt that the teachers were not sufficiently involved in the parent program. Three felt that there was need for more effective means of developing the children's self-concepts.

d. Discussion: In replying to the question: "In what areas were we successful?" all the supervisors addressed themselves to the behavior of both children and teachers. Implementation was seen as successful in those curriculum areas where skills were sequenced and delineated for the children and when methodology for teachers was either demonstrated or implicit in teaching these skills.

Thus, "self-concept," a curriculum goal which has occupied the thoughts of Institute staff since the inception of the program, is not viewed as an area of success. Perhaps, although qualitative judgments were being made, the attitude that may have pervaded the issue is that in the absence of behavioral objectives and quantitative measures of behavior, "success" is not concretely evident.

Such specificity seems equally important when measuring the progress of teachers. Thus, when curriculum staff set behavioral objectives, then observed teachers performing these objectives, supervisors felt there was evidence of growth. As pointed out by all supervisory staff, there is a critical need to continue in the development of appropriate techniques for inservice training. However, time and money are crucial factors, particularly when attempting to work with teachers who have all-day responsibilities in their classrooms. The consensus is that the Institute's prekindergarten and kindergarten programs enjoyed fuller implementation of innovative strategies because of the daily afternoon workshop experience of the teachers. As for the supervisors' concern for greater involvement of research staff, no doubt interdisciplinary synchronization is a factor to be considered in any complex organizational structure.

It is significant that Institute staff members view research personnel as an integral part of the demonstration study, but feel that even greater benefits to the classroom would accrue if the Institute research staff were more directly involved with solving curriculum problems. Inasmuch as several studies of Institute children's behavior will be undertaken beginning in September, it is likely that psychological staff will become more immersed in the demonstration program during the forthcoming year.

3. Teachers

a. Source: An overall evaluation of the curriculum was obtained qualitatively from teachers who directly or indirectly participated in the demonstration program. This group of personnel included IDS teachers and assistant teachers, "cluster" teachers (who are not assigned to a particular class and regularly take over a class each week, thereby relieving the classroom teacher for preparation periods), substitute teachers, and other teaching personnel who have familiarity with the demonstration classes. Included in this latter group would be those fourth-grade teachers whose class enrollments include children who completed the demonstration program at the end of the third grade, school librarians, and teaching paraprofessionals. All of the aforementioned personnel qualify as sources for providing personal impressions and evaluations of demonstration programs in that they have taught, observed, or at least had primary contact with the children in the demonstration program.

b. Method of Obtaining Information: The group-interview technique was employed as the primary method of obtaining information from teachers. Two members of the Institute research staff conducted interviews at each of the four schools in which there are demonstration classes. While one research staff member served as the interviewer, the other person was responsible for recording. Each interview session was prefaced with the emphasis that confidentiality and anonymity would be exercised in the recording and reporting of the interview. The teachers were also requested to be as spontaneous and "uninhibited" as possible in their impressions. The interviewer at all times was non-directive and generally reinforcing to all teacher comments, with the exception of those statements requiring amplification and clarification. The number of teacher participants at each interview session varied according to availability of the personnel; however, attendance ranged from eight to fifteen teachers a session. Examples of the questions are: 1) What do you feel are the strengths and weaknesses of the program? 2) Are there differences in the children and the classroom atmosphere of Institute classes as compared to other children and classes in the school? 3) Has your teaching style changed since you have been a part of the Institute's program? If there has been a change, to what do you attribute it? 4) How do you feel about the techniques you are using? 5) Are you satisfied with your working relationship with other personnel at the Institute; i.e., curriculum supervisors, psychologists, psychological examiners, etc.?

c. Summary: The corpus of information obtained from the interviews can be subsumed under three gross evaluative dimensions of the demonstration program: 1) strengths and weaknesses of the program, 2) evaluation of teacher techniques and styles, 3) differences between demonstration classes and regular Board of Education classes, and 4) attitudes of the Institute teachers towards other professional staff. The major strength of the program voiced by the teachers was the noticeable differences of children in the demonstration program. Most teachers, both Institute and non-Institute, concurred that the distinctive behavior of the experimental children was their independence in their classroom work. They have the ability to both follow through on lessons without assistance from the teacher and to choose individual games and activities. However, it is noteworthy that this same independent behavior was met with disapproval by some of the non-Institute teaching personnel. Cluster teachers lamented that this independence served as a retarding factor in group lessons in that the children seemed to be unaccustomed to learning in a large group and at times expressed resentment toward being a member of a large group.

There seemed to be no agreement on whether disciplinary problems were fewer in the demonstration class. While one cluster teacher related her difficuluty in getting the children to "line up properly" after lunch, another teacher in another school setting experienced few disciplinary problems while in the demonstration classes. Many teachers felt that the children were more verbally expressive than children not in demonstration classes. Generally, it appeared to the teachers that the children learned more and had a wider range of skills, e.g., one teacher stated that her first-grade class was able to write book reports at the end of the year--a phenomenon that she had never observed in other classrooms.

The two inter-related factors which the teachers interpreted as strengths of the program are the smaller class enrollments and the presence of a second teaching person. These factors enabled them to devote more individual attention to the children and plan the curriculum more effectively. However, they felt that the Institute had not clearly defined a policy related to the use of the assistant teacher. Therefore, they believed that fuller and more comprehensive utilization of the assistant teacher could be possible.

From the teachers' viewpoints, a major weakness was that materials were changed from year to year, for example, the substitution of the Sullivan Reading Program this year for the previously used Stern program. It was their feeling that guidelines which were offered and suggested to them were at times inadequate for implementation in the classroom. The teachers suggested that they should receive further delineation and definition of goals and follow-through in their use before they are expected to use certain materials. On the other hand, the majority of the teachers felt that their own teaching style was most affected by learning to work with an assistant and recognizing the need for individualization of instruction. Small-class enrollment enabled teachers to work with small groups and to employ diagnostic instructional techniques. They agreed that the Institute was responsible for these changes in their approaches to the classroom setting. One teacher, during an individual discussion, reported that the demonstration program has given her feelings of self-confidence, in allowing her to experiment with different materials and in soliciting her opinions of varying strategies. She said that this experience contributed enormously to her personal and professional growth. Another teacher stated that she would work only in an Institute-supervised class and not in a regular class.

When asked about professional relationships with other Institute personnel, teachers in the experimental classes tended to discuss difficulties in securing social services for the children. Examples were cited by the teachers where referrals are made to social workers and psychologists, and where yet virtually little was accomplished for the children and their families.

Perhaps the most controversial and indecisive area of opinion was the teachers' impressions of other Institute personnel. In particular, the function of the curriculum supervisor was challenged continually in terms of her role and relationship to the teacher. While there was no unanimous dissatisfaction with supervision, most teachers did expect more guidance and direction, especially for those who have had less experience. From the teachers' perspective, their professional development and the proper implementation of the demonstration curriculum was contingent upon closer supervision. Associated with this issue, the teachers felt that additional workshops and conferences would be helpful in improving relationships between the teaching and the research staffs.

d. Discussion: Much has been achieved in the use of this interview technique. Immediately, methodological limitations become apparent. From the interviewer's impressions, candor and spontaneity were sacrificed in that some teachers appeared reluctant to voice their opinions and sentiments publicly; the assistant teachers provided fewer comments than the head teachers, and Institute teachers generally exercised some restraint in their criticisms of the demonstration program in the presence of non-Institute teachers. In addition, some teachers were reluctant to express any opinions at all during the meetings. They neither supported nor contradicted their more outspoken colleagues. Although the use of the technique was more expedient than other methods (e.g., questionnaires), it has been suggested that subsequent interviews be conducted with smaller, more exclusive groups--i.e., only Institute head teachers; only assistant teachers; only cluster teachers, etc.

A pervasive issue evolving from the interviews was the teachers' expectations of the Institute and its staff members. Generally, the teachers would not ideologically adapt to the experimental nature of the program in terms of fluctuations and modifications of techniques, policies, and practices. Their allusions to formerly-used techniques, materials, etc., which were subsequently abandoned and replaced constituted a source of misunderstanding, confusion, and frustration about the Institute's program.

As did the supervisors, the teachers expressed the need for more inservice training and additional opportunities to involve research staff in the classroom setting. Some of the statements made indicated that those areas emphasized by supervisory personnel this year during inservice training workshops were not perceived by teachers as having affected their teaching behavior. And yet, both supervisors and teachers agree that by means of the Institute's approach to implementation of curriculum, individualization of instruction has become a unique and successful aspect of the program. The structure of the classroom is such that only through delineation of the assistant teacher's role and appropriate use of materials could this be possible. It is as though the teachers are not able to estimate their own progress.

As a result of the interviews, there has been considerable speculation about the need for development of additional inservice training strategies. We will need to include techniques by means of which changes in teaching behavior are more readily discernible. At this time in the Institute's program when most patterns have been established and when there will be few new teachers joining the staff, it is expected that supervisors will begin orientation of former teachers by eliciting from them suggestions for specific areas of inservice training for emphasis during the forthcoming academic year.

In addition, there will need to be orientation sessions among teachers, supervisors, and research staff to explain the limits of the Institute's resources in providing social and psychological services.

4. Parents

a. Source:

A sample of parents of children in our program was randomly selected for purposes of obtaining information regarding their assessment of the Institute program. Also included as assessment data were letters received from parents regarding their feelings about the program. These letters were written primarily by parents of children who would be entering fourth grade in the fall. Their concern was to appeal to the Institute to continue the program through sixth grade.

b. Method:

No formal questionnaire was devised for the selected sample. However, Community Aides who served as interviewers[1] were instructed as to the kind of information we were interested in obtaining. This included such items as: year of entry into the Institute program, differences noted after the child entered the program, comparison of achievement of Institute child with other siblings, indications of how parents may have been helped by the Institute, assessment of parent center, indication of any change of attitude on the part of parents regarding educational expectations of their children.

c. Summary:

Those parents whose children entered the program at pre-K noticed immediate changes, such as socialization, recognition of things around them, e.g., signs, pictures of animals, etc. and improvement in speech. Parents of children in the grades noticed differences such as basic attitude toward school:

---

[1] It was felt that parents might feel freer to discuss the program with the Community Aides.

> "My daughter seemed bored and lacked interest in school. Her teacher recommended that she be placed in the Institute class. When Paula entered the first grade Institute class, there was a miraculous change in her attitude toward school. She talked enthusiastically about the activities in school. She showed a keen interest in reading as well as arithmetic."

Or to quote another parent:

> "The Institute helps the children to get a better understanding of why school is really important."

Mainly, parents responded to the rate and quality of learning that takes place in the classes.

> "They learn much more things and faster."
>
> "It were as though he learn very fast and it is very good."

There seemed to be general agreement among parents that their other children did not learn as well or as much as the child in the Institute class. As evidence to this fact, one parent showed us letters from her third grade Institute child and her child entering seventh grade, both of whom were away at camp. The letter of the third grade child was far superior. Another parent reports that her daughter's day camp counselor wanted to know if she attended private school as her interest and performance in reading, spelling, and writing had inspired her peers to read and write their names. (This, incidentally, is a child who on our reading test scored somewhat below grade level.)

Parents' response to the help they themselves received included such remarks as:

> "Because of the lesson plans at the center and

> the instructions given by the Institute, I am able to converse with my children. Before this I was very much embarrassed when my children would ask me questions and I could not answer them....After entering the Center's program, I can now talk with them and don't feel embarrassed. I now have confidence in myself and feel secure.

Another response:

> "Whether it is no heat at home or I need a coat or clothing, the Community Aide goes into action and see that we receive them."
>
> "The parent center is also a great deal of help. They helped me with clothing and various other things."

Parents are now interested in having more parent discussion groups and parent-teacher workshops at the center. However, sewing still seems to be the most preferred activity.

d. **Discussion:**

When one considers that we are working in areas where the concern for parents and children is at best minimal, it is no wonder that the responses from our parents were of such a positive nature. Though funds restrict our program from being of the extent we would like, what has been offered to them appears to be much more than they have gotten from the regular school system. Perhaps the respect and concern we have shown both parents and children are the main ingredients that have made the difference. As one parent simply stated:

> "They work with us in helping with our problems---they understand the children they don't call them crazy."

5. Observers

a. Source: We are obliged, under our contract with OEO, to "service" behavioral scientists, teacher-training institution administrative and supervisory staff of programs similar to those of I.D.S., community organizations, paraprofessionals, and classroom teachers. Classroom teachers have the lowest priority for visiting, on the assumption that it is more economical to train supervisory staff who can in turn train and offer continuous support to their own teaching staff.

b. Method: Unsolicited letters were sent by observers to members of the Institute extra-mural training staff.

c. Summary: The numerous observers who visit our program constituted another source of evaluative information. An examination of our files, however, indicated that their letters are like those of polite dinner guests--all praise and little criticism of the menu served. Like many ego-starved educators, we appreciate the accolades, but question their validity as evaluative material.

Nevertheless, if we were to organize and analyze the comments of the observers, it would seem that they are most impressed with the climate of our classrooms, the independence with which our children operate, the high skill level at which the children function, and suitability of the Institute materials. Comments of this nature are the most frequent in the many letters received. Attached is a letter which typifies those received. (See addenda schedule IV.)

d. Discussion: Most who observed in our demonstration classes this year have had at least two years' association with their own early childhood programs for the disadvantaged. By and large, they are aware of the problems inherent in developing curriculum suitable to the age and population with which they work and they plan to borrow, imitate, and reproduce what we are doing. We suggest, as well, that they alter and innovate to answer their own specific needs.

Conclusions

In reviewing the information obtained by means of qualitative analyses, a number of significant factors emerges. A program which attempts to innovate and to join interdisciplinary forces must be supported by extensive, ongoing inservice training. The roles of participants require continuing as well as initial clarification because, hopefully, these roles will change and take on more complex dimensions as each person involved grows professionally. In allocating time for such training, existing teaching schedules need to be considered. For example, additional replacement teachers could be hired, or the school calendar could be changed from a five- to a four-day week.

The nature of the training should be such that teachers are provided both the skills and the opportunity to be actively involved in curriculum development. The more experienced the teacher, the more likely she tends to be victimized by an educational system which inhibits self-expression and initiative. Within the interdisciplinary setting, it is the responsibility of both curriculum and research staff to establish a climate in which professional adults as well as young children experience success through perceiving evidence of their own growth and accomplishments.

Another factor to be considered is that within an experimental program both the fundamental purposes and the limitations must be continuously articulated. Otherwise, serious misinterpretation and misunderstanding of the basic function of the organization may arise. One Institute staff member described this confusion by saying, "Many people see us as a service, when we are actually a study."

While the functions of "service" as opposed to "study" are not necessarily in opposition, there are marked limits to the capacity to "service" when funded as a "study." It is therefore impossible for an operational study to satisfy the numbers of requests made for psychological and social services. Even the community resources are not adequate to fill all such requests. This causes frustration among teachers.

A study is also limited in the amount and type of information that can be disseminated within the host schools. Results of research efforts can only be stated after analyses have been made and interpreted. Until that time, it is not possible to make positive recommendations to other educators. This causes irritation among principals and assistant principals.

And when recommendations do seem possible, it may be that school administrators would find the suggestions made to be incompatible with their notions of good classroom procedures. For example, many principals and assistant principals talk about affecting the learning process of children as a primary goal. But in practice, a quiet, teacher-dominated classroom is their main objective. To these people, it would be inconceivable that actual learning is taking place in a classroom where children are conversing freely with one another. Moreover, the interpretation of such a suggestion would be that one is recommending bedlam and chaos in classrooms. Therefore, another factor for innovative programs to consider is the need to reorient many educators to the notion that there is more than one way to implement curriculum successfully.

A final factor dramatically revealed by our interviews is that of all the sources of evaluation available, parents are the most significant in describing actual learning differences among children. Other sources when reporting qualitatively on the program appeared to focus more on specific adult interactions, rather than on general learning progress of children. Consequently, feedback on the children's relative growth can apparently be most realistically obtained through parents' appraisals.

In summary, our collection of interviews yields a fairly rounded view of how the program is perceived by a variety of people, both in it and outside it. On the whole, the views are encouraging, in that we seem to be accomplishing at least some of what we intend (e.g., independent learning behavior in the classrooms, increased verbal expressions by the children, etc.). The information obtained can also be helpful in planning the program for future years. Next year's interviews will indicate the extent to which changes introduced have been perceived and responded to.

II. QUANTITATIVE EVALUATIONS

A. Experimental vs. Control Samples

Sample Description:

During this period, follow-up psychological evaluations were made of experimental, filler, and control subjects. Experimental (E) subjects are children whose parents formally applied to the Institute for admission of their children into the enrichment program. Control Sample (Css) are self-selected in the sense that they meet the same criteria as the experimental group, but do not receive enrichment, serving instead as a control group for the factor of self-selection. Control Sample (Ck) are children from the same background (race, school, SES) as the experimental and self-selected control subjects, but have had no previous nursery or prekindergarten experience and start their formal training with kindergarten in regular nonenriched programs. Control Sample (Cl) consists of subjects from the same background who have had no school experience prior to entering regular nonenriched first-grade classes. Experimental "Fillers" have been added to the enrichment classes to overcome the problem of attrition in the Institute's experimental sample and to fulfill the Board of Education's regulation of minimum enrollment in its classes. Control Sample (Cc) are children from similar background (same race, SES, neighborhood) as E, Ck and Cl subjects, but who attend Head Start classes in a different Public School. This group was found necessary to utilize after the 4th wave because Css children were no longer available since if they were not admitted to the IDS program they were enrolled in a Head Start program elsewhere.

1. Standardized General Aptitude Testing

The subjects, ranging from prekindergarten through the fourth grade, were tested with the Stanford-Binet, Form L-M (S-B); Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Form A (PPVT); Columbia Mental Maturity Scale (CMMS); the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test; and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC).

a. Wave 1 (1962-63) As part of the basic design, experimental, control and filler subjects of the first wave were followed up with the S-B, PPVT, and CMMS. In all, 67 fourth graders were tested: 26E, 9Css, 12Ck, 12C_1, and 8 Fillers.

b. Wave 2 (1963-64) The S-B, PPVT, & CMMS were administered to 128 third graders: 20E; 15Css; 20Ck, 26C_1, and 47 Fillers. One hundred thirty-one subjects of this wave received the WISC. Of these, there were 21E, 16Css, 22Ck, 24C_1, and 48 Fillers.

c. Wave 3 (1964-65) These subjects were tested at the second grade level. The Lorge-Thorndike was administered to 154 children: 36E, 17Css, 35Ck, 32C_1, and 34 Fillers.

d. Wave 4 (1965-66) The Lorge-Thorndike was given to 117 of these first graders: 43E, 14Css, 36Ck, 21C_1, and 3 Fillers.

e. Wave 5 (1966-67) The basic battery of S-B, PPVT and CMMS was administered to 127 of these Kindergarten children. Of these, there were 52E, 32Ck and 43Cc.

f. Wave 6 (1967-68) The first posttest at the end of prekindergarten was administered to 99 subjects: 63E and 36Cc received S-B, PPVT and CMMS. A total of 1263 test sessions were conducted during this period for 697 subjects.

2. Specific Abilities Tests

Subjects were tested with the Gates-McGinitie Reading Test in first, second and third grades. The Reading Prognosis Test was given to Kindergarten subjects. A Battery of the Institutes Early Childhood Inventories, developed by Alan Coller and Jack Victor were given to prekindergarten, first-grade and second-grade subjects.

a. Wave 2 (1963-64) The Gates-McGinitie test was given to 115 third graders: 19E, 14Css, 19Ck, $16C_1$ and 47 Fillers.

b. Wave 3 (1964-65) The Gates-McGinitie was given to 140 second-grade subjects: 36E, 17Css, 31Ck, $23C_1$ and 33 Fillers.

c. Wave 4 (1965-66) 102 of these first graders received the Gates-McGinitie test. Of these, there were 38E, 11Css, 29Ck, $20C_1$ and 3 Fillers. In addition 71 subjects were given pre-post tests on six Early Childhood Inventories: Same/Different Inventory-3. (S/DI-3), Shape Name Inventory (SNI), Color Name Inventory (CNI), Alphabet Name Inventory/Printed Upper Case (ANI/PUC), Numeral Name Inventory-1 (NNI-1) and Body Parts Name Inventory (BPNI). The subject breakdown by groups was: 29E, 26Ck, and $16C_1$.*

d. Wave 5 (1966-67) 83 Kindergarteners (28E, 17Ck and 38Cc) were given the Reading Prognosis Test. 66 of these children were given the ECI battery (S/DI-3, SNI, CNI, ANI/PUC, NNI-1 and BPNI) on a pre-post basis. Five other ECI: Quantity Matching Inventory-1/Mathematics (QMI-1/M), Set Matching Inventory/Mathematics (SMI/M), Prepositions Inventory/Linguistic Concepts (PI/LC), Relational Concepts Inventory/Pre-Mathematics (RCI/PM) and Relational Concepts Inventory/Pre-Science (RCI/PS) were also administered in the post-test period. The subject breakdown by groups was: 28E, 10Ck and 28Cc.**

---

* 83 Subjects (32E, 30Ck and $21C_1$) received pre-tests.

** 78 Subjects (28E, 18Ck and 28Cc) received pre-tests.

e. Wave 5 (1967-68) 56 prekindergarten subjects were administered the ECI battery (S/DI-3, SNI, CMI, ANI/PUC, NNI-1 and LPNI) on a pre-post basis. The QMI-1/M, SMI/M, PI/LC, RCI/PM and RCI/PS were given at post-test time. The subject breakdown by groups was: 29E and 27 Cc.***

3. Data Analysis:

a. Standardized General Aptitude Testing

The data collected at the end of this reporting period are now being prepared for machine analysis.

Some data collected previously, has been analyzed. The results are shown in Tables 1-11.

Stanford-Binet data for the first four waves was analyzed to isolate wave, treatment and test period effects and their interactions. The analysis summarized in Table 1 indicates significant main effects for treatment and for test period. In addition, all interactions except wave x treatment are significant. The simple effects of the wave x test period and treatment x test period interactions were analyzed as shown in Tables 2 and 3. It appears, from an examination of the means (Table 4), and of Table 2, that the Wave 1 mean is higher at pretest, than those of the other waves. The differences between means of the waves vanish at the time of first and second posttests.

Table 3 indicates significant treatment differences at both posttest periods but not at pretest time (which is desirable). These differences (short term) are in favor of the E subjects (Table 4).

Similar analyses were done for the PPVT IQ scores. Table 5 shows significant main effects for treatment and test period as

---

[***] 60 Subjects (30E and 30Cc) received pre-tests.

well as a significant treatment x test period interaction. The simple effects analysis of the latter (Table 6) and examination of Table 7 indicate significant mean differences in favor of the E children for both posttest periods. No significant differences obtained at pretest time.

Table 8 displays the analysis of the CMMS IQ data. Again, the main effects of treatment and test period are significant. Here, however, the wave x test period interaction and the triple interaction are also significant. Tables 9 and 10 analyze the wave x test period interaction. There are no significant effects for wave at either of the test periods (Table 10) but for waves 1 and 4, we do find significant test period effects (Table 9). Table 11 shows these differences are probably due to the poorer performance of the Css subjects.

b. Specific Abilities Testing

The data collected at the end of this reporting period are now being prepared for machine analysis. In addition, scores for E, Css, Ck, and C_1 subjects are being collected for the purposes of analysis on the Metropolitan Reading and Arithmetic Tests. The Metropolitan Reading Test scores will be compared to the Gates-McGinitie test for purposes of validity measurement on this particular population and to determine the value of the Gates-McGinitie administration.

Pre-test results have been crudely analyzed for the ECI battery and a report on these results is given in the Appendix. Multi-Variate analysis (if feasible) or analysis of variance techniques will be utilized for more sophisticated tests of the results.

The results clearly show treatment effects at both kindergarten and first-grade levels in favor of the E subjects.

B. Experimental vs. Experimental

Specific Ability Comparisons:

Historical and detailed accounts of the enrichment program have been collected. These accounts have now been turned over to the research staff so that relevant comparisons can be made which test the efficacy of particular curriculum innovations.

Many of the most meaningful analyses of this type, unfortunately, will not be able to be made due to the lack of availability of specific ability test data especially in our earlier years when most of the changes were made. For example, at the end of 1966, Stern Structural Mathematics was dropped. The following year, a combination of IDS curriculum and the Rasmussen Math Lab was introduced. The most meaningful comparison would be a pre-post analysis of some type of mathematics test at first grade for our second (1963-64) and third wave (1964-65) children. Unfortunately, no such data is available.

C. Experimental vs. Experimental

Length of Exposure:

The question to be answered here is as follows: for children at the same grade level does involvement in our program over a period of years produce increased performance on certain instruments as compared to the performance of children with a shorter duration of exposure to our program? Specifically, we are asking whether experimental children differ on these tests from other children.

Since only the first two waves have completed third grade, we are waiting to do this analysis for at least one more wave to complete third grade. The reason for this decision is that insufficient number of fillers existing broken down to F_1, F_2, and F_3 (subscripts indicating grade entering IDS class).

A second serious problem was encountered upon checking into this question which further hampers any such E vs. F analysis. Certain al principles attempting to be kind to our program, but not at our encouragement, assigned as Fillers children who generally were high achievers. Since our E children were chosen without regard to this variable, any comparison is difficult to interpret. Pre-test data is, of course unavailable on our fillers since we are careful not to allow C subjects to become fillers. Hence, statistical control on IQ is likewise impossible.

D. Experimental Group

Pre-Post Tests:

These analyses deal with progress or trends shown within the group from beginning to end of test. Measures considered here, then are those which are administered only to IDS children and not to C groups.

In order to get at some evaluation of personal rather than cognitive growth, Davidson and Greenberg's School Behavior Rating Scale (SBRS) (1967) was rated by teachers and assistant teachers for all IDS children in a study conducted by Rhoda Cutler and Norman Wein. It was not feasible to have this scale rated for control children since they were scattered over many classes in the schools. The SBRS is constructed along three factors, Academic Efforts, Conformity to Authority Demands and Personal Qualities. To check on the validity of the scales, each of the three factors and total score of SBRS was correlated with either the latest Stanford-Binet or Lorge-Thorndike (which was the latest which depended on grade) test score. The results are presented in Table 12.

As can be seen only six of the twenty correlations differed from chance. Only two of five correlations between the factor of Academic Effort significantly correlated with IQ, although all five correlations exceeded .20. On the other hand, only one correlation exceeded .40.

More disturbing is the difference on correlation patterns from group to group which suggests serious limitations on the value of this grade for our uses.

Post-Test data are currently being analyzed.

E. Experimental vs. Experimental

Progress Analysis:

The question raised here is whether or not IDS has improved its program so that later waves improve more than earlier waves.

This question can in part be answered by analyzing wave effects in the analyses of variance performed in Section A, Photograph 2 of this part (Part II) of the progress report. It can be seen in Tables 1-11 that no wave effects are found for the SB, PPVT or CMMS.

Before reaching any conclusions regarding this question, three important considerations must be scalized: 1) The above analysis involves only the first four waves; 2) The analysis only considers data from pre-test, and post-test 1 and post-test 2 and hence only considers change through the end of kindergarten; 3) The measures evaluated are measures of general aptitude and therefore would be less sensitive educational change than achievement measures and specific abilities.

These factors, therefore, combine to make this analysis a most undefinitive measure at the IDS program's progress and further analyses are currently being done to complete and clarify this picture.

Table 1

S-B IQ: Wave (1-4) x Treatment (E/C_{ss}) x Test Period ($P/P_1/P_2$). Analysis of variance with repeated measures, unweighted means solution.

Source	SS	df	MS	
Between S's		204		
A (Wave)	1354.84	3	451.61	1.26
B (Treatment)	2036.15	1	2036.15	5.70[a]
AB	210.20	3	70.07	<1.00
Ss within grps.	70353.22	197	357.12	
Within S's		410		
C (Test Period)	1512.57	2	756.29	16.36[b]
AC	786.41	6	131.07	2.84[c]
BC	869.73	2	434.87	9.41
ABC	637.75	6	106.29	2.30[c]
CxS's within grps.	18212.35	394	46.22	

[a] F1,200 (.95) = 3.89

F1,200 (.99) = 6.76

[b] F2,400 (.99) = 4.66

[c] F6,400 (.95) = 2.12

F6,400 (.99) = 2.85

Table 2

Simple effects analysis for AC interaction (Wave x Test period) S-B IQ data of Table 1.

Simple
Effects:

Wave	SS	df	MS	F
for Test per. P	1587.77	3	529.26	3.53[a]
for Test per. P_1	324.84	3	108.28	<1.00
for Test per. P_2	335.49	3	111.83	<1.00
Error (pooled)	88565.57	591	149.86	

[a] F.95 (3,400) = 2.62

F.99 (3,400) = 3.83

Table 3

Simple effects analysis for BC interaction (Treatment x Test period) S-B IQ data of Table 1.

Simple
Effects:

Treatment	SS	df	MS	F
for Test per. P	25.44	1	25.44	<1.00
for Test per. P_1	2184.02	1	2184.02	14.57[b]
for Test per. P_2	696.58	1	696.58	4.65[a]
Error (pooled)	88565.57	591	149.86	

[a] F.95 (1,400) = 3.86

[b] F.99 (1,400) = 6.70

Table 4

Means and standard deviations of S-B IQ scores by wave, treatment and test period.

	Pretest		Posttest 1		Posttest 2		
	$\bar{X}$	s	$\bar{X}$	s	$\bar{X}$	s	N
Wave 1							
E	98.45	10.71	102.77	12.11	103.59	13.63	22
C_{ss}	100.00	8.14	92.57	8.36	92.29	10.12	7
Wave 2							
E	91.81	10.75	98.69	9.45	95.89	11.42	36
C_{ss}	90.23	14.99	90.54	13.77	96.08	15.07	13
Wave 3							
E	93.68	10.75	101.40	11.05	102.32	12.19	53
C_{ss}	91.50	14.03	94.79	11.32	98.71	18.56	14
Wave 4							
E	90.96	12.12	99.02	11.81	99.60	13.56	50
C_{ss}	89.60	10.43	92.20	12.16	95.60	8.30	10
All Waves							
E	93.08	11.45	100.44	11.27	100.22	12.96	161
C_{ss}	92.05	13.30	92.59	12.02	96.21	14.60	44

Table 5

PPVT IQ: Wave (1-4) x Treatment (E/C_{SS}) x Test period (P/P_1P_2). Analysis of variance with repeated measures, unweighted means solution

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between S's		211		
A (Wave)	708.71	3	236.24	<1.00
B (Treatment)	8097.72	1	8097.42	14.39^a
AB	2345.36	3	781.79	1.38
S's within grps.	114788.41	204	562.68	
Within S's		424		
C (Test period)	15744.01	2	7872.01	60.83^b
AC	676.53	6	112.76	<1.00
BC	2666.29	2	1333.15	10.30^b
ABC	376.40	6	62.73	<1.00
CxS's within grps	52805.15	408	129.42	

$^aF_{.99}\ (1,200) = 6.76$

$^bF_{.99}\ (2,\infty) = 4.61$

Table 6

Simple effects analysis of BC interaction (Treatment x test period) PPVT IQ data of Tables

Simple effects of Treatment:	SS	df	MS	F
for Test per. P	146.15	1	146.15	<1.00
for Test per. P_1	7017.05	1	7017.05	25.62^a
for Test per. P_2	3600.63	1	3600.63	13.65^a
Error (pooled)	167593.56	612	273.85	

$^aF_{.99}\ (1,\infty) = 6.63$

Table 7

Means and standard deviations of PPVT IQ scores by wave, treatment and test period.

	Pretest		Posttest 1		Posttest 2		
	$\bar{X}$	s	$\bar{X}$	s	$\bar{X}$	s	N
Wave 1							
E	78,14	17,18	90.86	16.10	92.00	17.75	22
C_{ss}	67.67	17.91	67.11	16.27	76.56	13.19	9
Wave 2							
E	65.04	14.41	81.51	18.40	87.76	16.13	37
C_{ss}	68.62	18.24	70.31	22.69	83.00	17.45	13
Wave 3							
E	68.23	14.78	82.21	17.12	87.08	13.92	53
C_{ss}	66.20	11.06	71.20	16.79	79.50	21.90	20
Wave 4							
E	67.46	14.66	82.73	18.63	87.40	14.36	48
C_{ss}	68.30	11.63	72.50	13.40	74.90	13.16	10
All Waves							
E	68.63	15.54	83.39	18.00	88.01	15.24	160
C_{ss}	67.46	16.74	70.52	18.00	78.98	18.23	52

Table 8

CMMS IQ: Wave (1-4) x Treatment (E/C_{SS}) x Test period ($P/P_1/P_2$). Analysis of variance with repeated measures, unweighted means solution:

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between S's		178		
A (Wave)	45.44	3	15.15	<1.00
B (Treatment)	2369.76	1	2369.76	7.37[a]
AB	192.80	3	64.27	<1.00
S's within grps	54978.93	171	321.51	
Within S'ss		358		
C (Test period)	1010.88	2	505.44	5.14[b]
AC	1743.88	6	290.65	2.95[c]
BC	188.80	2	94.40	<1.00
ABC	1840.96	6	306.83	3.12[c]
CxS's within grps	33663.62	342	98.43	

$^{a}F_{.99}\ (1,200) = 6.76$

$^{b}F_{.99}\ (2,\infty) = 4.61$

$^{c}F_{.99}\ (6,\infty) = 2.80$

Table 9

Simple effects analysis of AC interaction (Wave by test period) CMMS data of Table 8.

Simple effects **of Test period:**	SS	df	MS	F
for Wave 1	1432.00	2	716.00	7.27[a]
for Wave 2	71.04	2	35.52	$<$ 1.00
for Wave 3	12.80	2	6.40	$<$ 1.00
for Wave 4	1238.56	2	619.28	6.29[a]
Error (within)	33663.62	342	98.43	

$F_{.99}(2,\infty) = 4.61$

Table 10

Simple effects analysis of AC interaction (Wave by test period) CMMS data of Table 8.

Simple effects **of Wave:**	SS	df	MS	F
for Test period P	477.28	3	159.09	$<$ 1.00
for Test period P_1	656.32	3	218.77	1.27
for Test period P_2	655.52	3	218.51	1.26
Error (pooled)	88642.55	513	172.79	

Table 11

Means and standard deviations of CMMS IQ scores by wave, treatment and test period.

	Pretest		Posttest 1		Posttest 2		
	$\bar{X}$	s	$\bar{X}$	s	$\bar{X}$	s	N
Wave 1							
E	102.73	13.38	101.23	14.59	98.86	12.18	22
C_{ss}	103.89	16.65	89.67	11.54	90.78	9.41	9
Wave 2							
E	102.00	11.05	101.70	11.40	95.84	11.61	37
C_{ss}	95.92	10.30	92.62	8.35	98.38	15.52	13
Wave 3							
E	103.18	12.78	98.53	10.67	98.75	12.09	40
C_{ss}	93.56	18.20	98.25	13.50	99.56	17.00	16
Wave 4							
E	100.79	12.97	105.03	14.26	98.24	15.52	34
C_{ss}	98.25	9.01	98.25	12.06	88.13	4.75	8
All Waves							
E	102.17	12.51	101.52	12.78	97.83	13.00	133
C_{ss}	97.07	15.08	94.98	12.08	95.52	14.55	46

Table 12

SBRS: N's, $\overline{X}$'s, SD's, r's, and levels of significance for Grades Pre-kindergarten through Third.

Grade & School	Sub Score	Test	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	r	P
PreKindergarten	Academic Effort	S-B IQ	28	43.68	13.86	.32	NS
(P.S.68&175)	Conformity to Authority		28	20.93	6.21	-.06	NS
"	Personal Qualities	"	28	21.14	5.65	.34	NS
"	Total	"	28	85.75	23.00	.25	NS
Kindergarten	Academic Effort	"	21	41.10	6.52	.31	NS
(P.S.68)	Conformity to Authority	"	21	23.38	2.78	-.04	NS
	Personal Qualities	"	21	22.48	3.08	.03	NS
	Total	"	21	86.95	10.84	.26	NS
1st.Grade	Academic Effort	"	13	38.00	9.32	.81	$<.01$
(P.S.79)	Conformity to Authority	"	13	17.85	4.76	.34	NS
	Personal Qualities	"	13	20.54	2.33	.56	$<.05$
	Total	"	13	76.38	13.06	.80	$<.01$
2nd. Grade	Academic Effort	L-T IQ	44	44.59	12.26	.38	$<.02$
(P.S.68,79,	Conformity to Authority	"	44	21.25	6.35	.17	NS
175)	Personal Qualities	"	44	24.59	5.30	.36	$<.02$
	Total	"	44	90.43	19.42	.39	$<.01$
3rd. Grade	Academic Effort	"	33	46.09	9.69	.23	NS
(P.S.90, 175)	Conformity to Authority	"	33	22.94	5.33	.04	NS
	Personal Qualities	"	33	23.67	4.74	.34	NS
	Total	"	33	92.70	16.88	.24	NS

III. PARENT PROGRAM

The Parent Center has served a variety of functions and was the scene of numerous activities. Its meaning to the parents varied according to their needs and desires.

To parents who sought help with personal and environmental -- especially housing and Welfare -- problems, the Center was a place to receive that help. Direct assistance and moral support from Parent Center personnel often resulted in improvement in the parents' situation. At times when more extensive services were needed, referrals to an appropriate agency were made.

One parent who had been on the waiting list for a housing project for seven years came to the Center for help. She had a family of nine and they were housed in a 2½ room apartment. Her oldest daughter in high school complained about her school work because she had no place to study. We arranged for the daughter to come to the Center after school, where she was given a quiet place to study. We helped the mother to use all possible resources, i.e., letters to the Mayor, contacting the Health Department to rule present living conditions hazardous to health, along with frequent visits to the Housing Authority in order to obtain a 7½ room apartment in a housing project. After five months of persistence, the family has been placed in the new Polo Grounds Project.

To parents who wished to come by for a brief coffee klatsch, or an hour or so of games, the Parent Center was a recreation center. Although certain days had been designated as Game Days, parents felt free to stop in when they wished and were welcomed whenever they appeared.

There were parents who wanted to learn to sew or knit; for them materials and instruction were provided. One mother, who had never before sewed a single stitch, made four dresses, including an Easter outfit, for her young daughter and one dress for herself. Her family was so impressed with the skill that she developed that her adult daughter purchased a new sewing machine for her, and she is delightedly sewing clothes for all the female members of her family. Another family reported that not only had their mother learned to provide them with attractive clothing (she, too, was a beginner), but that her whole outlook had changed for the better, and the entire family benefitted. Actually the sewing class proved to be a favorite activity among the mothers, who not only acquired new skills, but discussed and exchanged ideas and information about many of their personal concerns.

From time to time special activities of interest to parents were scheduled. On two different occasions community lawyers came to the Center and gave lively and informative talks on the rights of the poor and on Welfare rights.

The Parent Center was also the scene of some meetings of class parents by grade, at which they were introduced to some of the materials used by their children in the classroom. They were shown how they could make these materials themselves and encouraged to use them for helping the child at home. Materials were also available continuously at the Parent Center so that parents' use need not be limited to class meetings.

In order to insure maximum participation at parent meetings certain procedures were established: three weeks before the meeting notices are to be sent out, polling the parents as to the most convenient time for a meeting. In the notice, purpose and topics of discussion are listed; on the basis of the returns the time of the meeting is scheduled (evening meetings seem to be the preference). A second notice is sent out a week in advance announcing the date of the meeting. This is followed by home visits and phone calls by the Community Aide; a last minute reminder is then given to the children.

While topics regarding class content were of interest to parents, parents also take the opportunity to discuss such things as social interaction and behavior patterns of the children. One such meeting centered around "fighting". This usually took place at lunch time and at the end of the school day. The parents decided to (1) arrange to meet with the Principal to request more adult coverage during the lunch period, (2) parents when possible would meet their children at the end of the school day, (3) in the event of a fight, parents of both children will be asked to come in to discuss the matter, (4) parents will make an effort to visit the classroom.

The parents also participated in several outings: a trip to Radio City with dinner at a downtown restaurant, and a trip to the Schomberg Collection with a discussion and film on Negro History. A family outing (in cooperation with Grumman Aircraft, who provided transportation and refreshments) to Calverton, Long Island for a picnic and an Air Show proved to be one of the highlights of the year. Approximately sixty families participated. For some, it was their first time ever being in the country with their families.

The following is a description of another experience among children, parents and teaching personnel provided by the Institute.

On June 25, 1968 the Institute for Developmental Studies gave a dinner party at New York University honoring the children in the third grade classes, their parents, and their present and former teachers.

The 1967-68 school year was the first year in which the Institute program had third-grade classrooms in each of the four schools, and it marked the end of our work with these children, many of whom had been in the Institute program since pre-kindergarten, and would be absorbed into the regular fourth grades of the schools. A meeting was held at the Parent Center where our basic ideas were presented and the parents were asked to respond to them and to tell us whether they would like the party to be held at New York University or at a location in Harlem. The parents were enthusiastic about the basic plans and preferred that the party be held in a university setting. They also suggested names of community leaders and dignitaries they would like to invite. Funds were secured through small contributions of individuals and business institutions.

The parents and children were brought by bus from central locations in Harlem and were greeted at Loeb Student Center by James Farmer, who had taken an hour from a busy schedule to attend, by Dr. Martin Deutsch and by other members of the Institute staff. The dinner was held in the lovely environment provided by the Eisner and Lubin auditorium, the round tables seating eight to ten people were set with linen clothes, silver, and crystal, and were decorated with fresh flowers. We made certain that families, teachers, and Institute staff were present at each table. This mingling of people and the balloons given to the children quickly established the atmosphere of a party. We were particularly pleased at the visiting that went on among the tables as children and former teachers saw each other and, between courses, went over to greet each other. Younger and older brothers and sisters who had come to the party were taken around by their "honored" siblings to meet teachers and friends.

The program for the party was extremely simple. The children joined together to sing a number of African songs, under the leadership of Mr. Andre Fisher. A parent representative briefly addressed the assemblage to thank the Institute for its efforts in upgrading the academic achievements of the children. She also took the opportunity to appeal to the Institute to continue its program through the sixth grade. This was followed by their receiving "Certificates of Achievement" from Dr. Deutsch. Although the ceremony had none of the heavy pomp and circumstance of "graduation", it was impressive and moving.

From the response of the parents and the Institute staff and from the children's enthusiastic accounts and re-enactments of the party the next day, it seems no exaggeration to label the party an "unforgetable experience." A number of the children have decided that they are going to college at New York University, while others stated that since they had already graduated from N.Y.U. they would go to another college. The classroom teachers reported receiving letters from a number of parents expressing their pleasure with the party and their sadness that the Institute program ended at the end of the third grade year. The grandmother of one of the third-grade children, who has been caring for her three grandsons since the death of their mother two years ago, told one of our staff members that the party was the "first time since my daughter died that I can go home without a heavy heart," and that it was "the first time in two years that I have sat down to a meal that someone else cooked and served." Another grandmother came to the second grade classroom the following day with her grandson's certificate of achievement already under glass and in a silver frame and asked the teacher if she could speak to the children for a few minutes. She then showed the children the certificate and talked with them about studying hard so that at the end of the third grade they would be honored at a party "just like the one last night."

It seems that a precedent has been established.

IV. EXTRA-MURAL TRAINING PROGRAM

From May 1, 1968 to August 31, 1968 the extra-mural training division of the Institute for Developmental Studies continued planning and organizing training and orientation sessions for OEO-funded Head Start programs.

Participating in the training sessions we organized were school administrators, supervisors, behavioral scientists, teachers, and paraprofessionals. They called on our skills and experience to help them find more effective ways of working with problems like these:

How do we overcome the tendency of some of our teachers to give too much custodial care?

What can you tell us about the nature of very young children, especially very young disadvantaged children?

How do we select and orient parents to work in the classroom or on the advisory board?

How can teachers guide parents in the tutorship of their own children?

How do we use the second person in the classroom?

How do we give on-going in-service training at our own centers?

As we continued our specialized training workshops for OEO-sponsored Head Start programs, we, of course, refined our own techniques and strategies.

One of the highlights of our work these past months was the two-day workshop at the Institute for Developmental Studies for 50 people from OEO-funded Head Start programs from all over the country. Schedules for that workshop and all other training activities for the period from April 30, 1968 to August 31, 1968 are on the following pages.

It should be noted that many of the tentative plans to serve OEO Head Start programs were cancelled at their request because they were forced to limit their operational budget following the congressional action of December, 1967.

The following indicate the extent to which services were rendered from May 1, 1968 through August 31, 1968:

May 4	Workshop for the Long Island Preschool Program.
May 9	All-day workshop for pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers of District 13, New York City Board of Education.
May 10	Conference on reading sponsored by New York University at the Statler Hilton Hotel in New York City: "A Debate on the Great Debate."
May 11	All-day workshop for the United Planning Organization Head Start programs of Washington, D.C. area for 500 teachers, teacher aides, and supervisors. This workshop was the culmination of much cooperative effort both by phone and in person with Director Mrs. Virginia Morris, Mrs. Mildred Buck and their workshop planning committee. The workshop agenda is appended here.
May 13 and 14	Visited and observed program of Dr. Marie Hughes, Director, Early Childhood Program, University of Arizona.
May 22 and 23	Two-day workshop at IDS for 50 Head Start leaders from all over the country. All phases of the IDS program were discussed and then demonstrated in classroom observations. The agendas for the two days are appended here.

May 27	Lecture and discussions for Assistant Principals in charge of Early Childhood Education for District 13, Brooklyn, New York.
June 4	Observations at P.S. 175 Manhattan for teacher aides in a New York City Head Start program.
June 17	Discussant in Head Start Directors' meeting under the auspices of the New York University OEO Regional Office.
July-August	Development of plans for training program for 1968-69 school year.

HEAD START DAY CARE TRAINING SEMINAR
UNITED PLANNING ORGANIZATION

PROGRAM
Saturday, May 11, 1968
MORNING SESSION

GENERAL SESSION-9:30 A.M.--Auditorium
Presiding - Virginia Morris
Preschool/Day Care Coordinator

GREETINGS

ADDRESS: Dr. Eddie Ponder, Research Associate Professor of Education, Extra-Mural Training Program, New York University School of Education
"Socio-Psychological Characteristics of Disadvantaged Children"

Snack Preview-10:35 A.M. to 10:45 A.M.-Cafeteria

WORK SEMINARS-10:45 A.M. to 12:00 A.M.

Group I - "IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL SERVICES PERSONNEL,"
Edith Calhoun, Consultant, Extra-Mural Training Program, New York University School of Education

Group II - "IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING PERSONNEL,"
Edwina Meyers, Consultant, Extra-Mural Training Program, New York University School of Education

Group III - "IMPLICATIONS FOR SUPERVISORY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL,"
Eddie Ponder, Research Associate Professor of Education

Group IV - "IMPLICATIONS FOR NUTRITIONAL PERSONNEL,"

Panel Discussions:
Mildred Brooks, Home Economics Consultant, D.C. Public Welfare
"Food Power"

Sue Sadow, Senior Nutrition Consultant, OEO
"Nutrition in Child Development Centers"

Mrs. Robert Powers, Nutrition Consultant (Volunteer), Capital Head Start
"Child Nutrition"

Mrs. Edith Harris, Nutritionist, NCACDCA
"Parent Involvement in the Nutrition Program"

Mrs. Myrta Menendez, Nutritionist, Capital Head Start
"Food Service Training"

Bag Lunch-12:00 P.M.-Cafeteria

AFTERNOON SESSION

LET'S TALK DISCUSSION GROUPS-1:30 to 3:00

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION GROUPS-3:00-Auditorium

RESPONSE PANEL
- Dr. Eddie Ponder
- Edith Calhoun
- Edwina Meyers
- Mildred Brooks
- Katheryn Dodson, Director, MS - PS
- Audrey Gibson, Director, ACD
- David Goldstein, Director, C.H.S.
- Lucille Lyons, Director, F. F.
- Edna Robinson, Director, H. H.
- Eloise Smith, Director, S. B. M.
- Thomas Taylor, Director, NCACDCA

ADJOURNMENT-4:00 P.M.

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

AGENDA: May 9, 1968

8:45 - 11:30

Public School 68, 127 W. 127th Street, NYC, Room 103. Observation of Institute Pre-K and K classes with Edwina Meyers, Caroline Saxe, and Dr. Edward Ponder.

Institute teachers to be observed:

Pre-K
- Edna Barnett,
- Leslie Johnson (Asst. Teacher)
- Emily Gwathmey,
- Barbara Margolin (Asst. Teacher)

K
- Maria Gravel,
- Barbara David (Asst. Teacher)

12:00 - 1:00

Luncheon at Well's Restaurant, 2249 Seventh Avenue, New York City ($2.60 (including tip)

1:00 - 3:00

Meeting at Well's Restaurant:

Question and Answer Period for discussion of techniques observed in the classroom.

Institute teacher and Fay Fondiller, Institute supervisor for P.S. 68.

The Role of the Second Adult in the Classroom: Emily Gwathmey.

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

AGENDA: May 22 and 23, 1968

WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 1968

8:30 - 9:00	Registration
9:00 - 9:15	Welcome: Dr. Edward G. Ponder
9:15 - 9:30	Greeting: Dr. Martin Deutsch
9:30 - 10:00	Overview: Miss Edwina Meyers
10:00 - 10:15	Break
10:15 - 11:00	Influence of Classroom Environment Upon Learning: Mrs. Caroline Saxe
11:00 - 11:30	Discussion
11:30 - 1:00	Lunch at Well's Restaurant ($2.60 including tip)
1:00 - 2:15	Approaches to Language Development: Dr. Ponder, Miss Ann Shaw
2:15 - 2:30	Break
2:30 - 3:30	From Practice to Theory: Sequence Games for Accomplishment of Instructional Objectives: Dr. Lassar Gotkin
3:30 - 4:00	Discussion

THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1968

9:00 - 12:00	Observations at the Institute's Enrichment Classes at P.S. 68 and P.S. 175
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch at Well's Restaurant ($2.60 including tip)
1:30 - 4:00	Seminar and discussion
	Parents in Community Involvement: Miss Edith Calhoun
	Supervisory Curriculum Staff

V. ADDENDA

Schedule I

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

READING REPORT FORM

Name______________________ Class________ Date______________

School_____________________ Teacher_________________________

READING ACHIEVEMENT

Gates Mac Ginitie Reading Test: ___ ___ ___

Performance in Class

I. Word Recognition

A. Phonics

Initial Sounds______________________________
Final Sounds________________________________
Vowel Sounds: Short___________ Long_________
Blends______________________________________

B. Structural Analysis

Root Words and Endings______________________
Syllabication_______________________________
Sight Vocabulary____________________________

II. Comprehension

A. Vocabulary

Knowledge of Word Meanings
Verbal Expression

B. Story Analysis

Ability to Follow Sequence of Story
Knowledge of Details
Ability to Understand the Main Idea

MATERIALS USED

Sullivan Workbooks Completed: Book____ Page No.____________
Sullivan Supplementary Readers: Book_______________________
Stern Workbooks Completed: Book____ Page No._______________
SRA Reading Laboratory Level_______________________________
Readers Digest Skillbuilders Level_________________________
Merrill Linguistic Readers Level___________________________
Charles Merrill Readers____________________________________
Bank Street Readers____

Schedule I
(continued)

Institute for Developmental Studies
Reading Report Form

Name______________________________ Date______________________________

Games

Additional Materials

Individualized Reading Approximate Number of books read ______

Approximate Grade Level________________

Special Reading Interests

General Comments

Schedule II

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

MATHEMATICS REPORT FORM

Name________________________ Class______________ Date____________

School______________________ Teacher__________________________

I. Achievement

Standardized Test______________ Date Administered______________

Scores ______________ ______________ ______________
Computation Problem Solving Average

II. Performance in Class

	A. Concept		B. Skills	
	Introduced	Mastered	Introduced	Mastered
1. Sets:				
Equivalent				
Non-equivalent				
Subset				
Empty set				
Other				
2. Addition				
3. Subtraction				
4. Place Value				
5. Multiplication				
6. Division				
7. Exchange:				
Addition				
Subtraction				
Multiplication				
Division				
8. Fractions				
9. Measurement:				
Time				
Volume				
Linear				
Money				
Weight				
Area				
10. Roman Numerals				
11. Other				

Schedule III

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR REPORT

Name ______________________________ Class ____________ Date __________

School ____________________________ Teacher ____________________________

Careful and neat in doing his homework and classwork. ____

Shows concern about how well he is doing in his work but is not over anxious. ____

Is easily discouraged; gives up if he feels he is not succeeding in new or difficult tasks. ____

Fearful; tense; timid; gets upset when called upon in class. ____

Goes to library corner or school library to select books on his own when he has free time. ____

Gets angry easily; gets into fights with other children. ____

Listless; tired; easily fatigued. ____

Is responsible; can be depended upon to carry out a task. ____

Curious; eager to learn new things; asks questions in order to obtain further information or clairification. ____

Does more than required; goes beyond assignment. ____

Considers and plans carefully before answering a question or starting an activity. ____

Works best when encouraged and told he is doing well. ____

The child works best in the following group arrangement:

Individual ____
Small Group (4-6) ____
Large Group (8-12) ____
Whole Class ____

General Comments

Class Activities

Trips Taken Special Interests Special Projects

Schedule IV

BEHAVIORAL SCIENTISTS

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

BUREAU OF CHILD GUIDANCE

Brooklyn Center
362 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11217
MAin 5-5010

Headquarters
80 Lafayette Street, New York, New York 10013
BEekman 3-7550

SIMON S. SILVERMAN, Ph. D.
Director
JAMES N. RINALDI
Assistant Director
MARVIN N. GREENSTEIN
Assistant Director (Acting)

ALBERT S. HOTKINS, M.D.
Chief School Psychiatrist
PAULINE C. ZISCHKA, Ph. D.
Chief School Psychiatric Social Worker
RACHEL M. LAUER, Ph. D.
Chief School Psychologist

April 12, 1968

Mrs. Caroline Saxe
Institute For Developmental Studies
N.Y.U. School of Education
Washington Square
New York, N.Y. 10003

Dear Mrs. Saxe,

This is to confirm our appointment for Tuesday, May 14th at 9 A.M. at P-68 Manhattan.

As we discussed on the telephone, several psychologists who are working with young children from Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 3, are interested in learning about your program. They are particularly interested in how the concepts and techniques which have been developed by the Institute, can be utilized for the children with whom they are working in the schools.

I will let you know how many people are planning to attend.

Sincerely yours,

Louise B. Lowenstein

Louise B. Lowenstein
Supervisor of School Psychologists

LBL:frk